

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)
)
v.) No. 2:13-CR-82
)
ADAM LEE PUTMAN)

This criminal case is before the Court on the defendant's *pro se* motion for a sentence reduction, [Doc. 72]. In the defendant's motion, the defendant requests that the Court resentence him pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) and in accordance with Amendment 782 and Amendment 788 to the United States Sentencing Guidelines Manual. The government has responded, [Doc. 73], and the matter is ripe for review. For the reasons that follow, the motion is DENIED.

“Federal courts are forbidden, as a general matter, to modify a term of imprisonment once it has been imposed, but the rule of finality is subject to a few narrow exceptions.” *Freeman v. United States*, 131 S. Ct. 3685, 2690 (2011) (internal citation and quotation marks omitted). One exception is identified in 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2):

1

The United States Supreme Court has interpreted § 3582(c)(2) as setting forth two requirements for a sentence reduction. First, “the defendant [must] ha[ve] been sentenced to a term of imprisonment based on a sentencing range that has subsequently been lowered by the Sentencing Commission[.]” *United States v. Riley*, 726 F.3d 756, 758 (6th Cir. 2013) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). Second, “such reduction [must be] consistent with applicable policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted). If the reviewing court determines that the defendant is eligible for a sentence reduction, then “[t]he court may then ‘consider whether the authorized reduction is warranted, either in whole or in part, according to the factors set forth in § 3553(a).’” *United States v. Thompson*, 714 F.3d 946, 949 (6th Cir. 2013) (quoting *Dillon v. United States*, 560 U.S. 817, 826 (2010)).

In determining whether a defendant has been sentenced to a term of imprisonment based on a sentencing range that has subsequently been lowered by the Sentencing Commission, the Court must first determine “the amended guideline range that would have been applicable to the defendant had the relevant amendment been in effect at the time of the initial sentencing.” *Dillon*, 560 U.S. at 827 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted); *see also* U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 1B1.10(b)(1). Other than substituting Amendment 782 for the corresponding provision applicable when the defendant was originally sentenced, the Court “shall leave all other guideline application decisions unaffected.” *Id.* And the Court “shall not” reduce a defendant’s term of imprisonment to a term “less than the minimum of the amended guideline range,” nor to a term “less than the term of imprisonment the defendant has already served.” *Id.* § 1B1.10(b)(2)(A), (C).¹ In addition to these limits, section 1B1.10 states that a

¹Section 1B1.10 provides one exception to the rule that a defendant may not receive a sentence below the amended guideline range—namely, if the defendant originally received a below-guideline sentence “pursuant to a government

court must also consider the § 3553 factors and the danger to the public created by any reduction in a defendant's sentence. *Id.* at cmt. n.1(B). A court may further consider a defendant's post-sentencing conduct. *Id.*

On the other hand, even if Amendment 782 were to lower a defendant's offense level under Chapter Two of the Sentencing Guidelines, a court proceeds sequentially through the Guidelines Manual. *Id.* § 1B1.1. In Chapter Five, the guidelines instruct that "[w]here a statutorily required minimum sentence is greater than the maximum of the applicable guideline range, the statutorily required minimum sentence shall be the guideline sentence." *See* U.S.S.G. § 5G1.1(b); *United States v. Johnson*, 564 F.3d 419, 423 (6th Cir. 2009); *see also United States v. Coats*, 530 F. App'x 553, 555 (6th Cir. 2013).

II. Factual Background

The defendant pleaded guilty to possession with intent to distribute methamphetamine in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1) and (b)(1)(C) and possession of a firearm in furtherance of a drug trafficking offense in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 924(c)(1)(A). [Docs. 56, 67]. The defendant was sentenced on December 8, 2014, and the 2014 Guidelines Manual was used to calculate his Guidelines range of 18 to 24 months for the drug offense. The firearm offense carried a statutory mandatory minimum sentence of 60 months' imprisonment. Additionally, the defendant was sentenced pursuant to a binding Rule 11(c)(1)(C) plea agreement where the parties agreed to a sentence of 24 months' imprisonment for the drug offense and 60 months' imprisonment for the firearm offense to run consecutively for a total net sentence of 84 months.

III. Analysis

motion to reflect the defendant's substantial assistance to authorities." U.S. Sentencing Guidelines § 1B1.10(b)(2)(B). That is not the case here.

Amendment 782 to the Guidelines, which became effective on November 1, 2014, revised the Guidelines applicable to drug-trafficking offenses by reducing by two levels the offense levels assigned to the drug quantities described in section 2D1.1. U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual App. C, amend. 782. Amendment 782 also makes corresponding changes to section 2D1.11. Amendment 788, which became effective on November 1, 2014, as well, identified Amendment 782 as retroactive. U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual App. C, amend. 788.

The defendant was sentenced in December 2014, and he actually received the benefit of Amendment 782 because it was already incorporated into the Sentencing Guidelines at the time of his sentencing. Thus, he has already received the full benefit of the amendment. As such, the motion is DENIED.

III. Conclusion

For the reasons stated herein, the defendant's motion, [Doc. 72], is DENIED. All provisions of the Judgment, [Doc. 67], shall remain in effect.

ENTER:

s/J. RONNIE GREER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE